Agenda item: 01

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, P.E., Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Access control resolution, STPS 430-1(5)1**
Canyon Ferry Road – Lewis and Clark County, MT

Background

MDT is moving forward on the final design and the acquisition of right-of-way for this project. Part of this process involves access management discussions, and what degree of access will be allowed on Canyon Ferry Road. Limited access is proposed to improve the safety and through mobility of this section of roadway. Canyon Ferry Road is a limited access facility from the outskirts of Helena to the beginning of this project, and extending the access control through this section of Canyon Ferry Road is consistent with MDT's approach to access management.

Before moving forward with individual landowner negotiations, it is necessary to bring this concept before the Transportation Commission for approval.

SCOPE OF WORK OF PROJECT – Reconstruct Canyon Ferry Road from milepost ~1.1 to ~9.2, the junction with S-284, Spokane Creek Road. This will include the addition of a two-way left-turn lane in the commercial/residential area, the addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of Canyon Ferry Road and Wylie Drive, and the application of access management to limit the number and location of private access points.

LOCATION – The project is located in Lewis & Clark County, beginning at milepost 1.066 on route S-430, Canyon Ferry Road, and continuing east 8.175 miles to MP 9.241, at the junction with S-284, Spokane Creek Road.

SAFETY ANALYSIS/JUSTIFICATION – Along the commercial/residential section of this roadway, MP 1.0 – 4.2, the accident trend is collisions between moving vehicles. Of the 125 recorded crashes, 83 (66%) were coded as 'in intersection', 'intersection related' or 'in driveway access'. In 52 of the 125 crashes, at least one of the vehicles intended to turn.

Limiting the number and location of access points in this area, combined with the addition of the two-way left-turn lane, is intended to address the identified accident trend.

Along the rural section of this roadway, MP 4.2 – 9.2, the accident rate and severity rate are lower than statewide averages. The recorded crashes were not concentrated at any location and did not indicate an accident trend.

Limiting the number of access points in this area is intended to ensure that an accident trend does not develop similar to the more developed commercial/residential area as growth extends along this corridor.

ACCESS MANAGEMENT APPROACH – Access management is a response to the problems of congestion, capacity loss, and accidents. It sets forth guidelines for managing access points and spacing along a highway, adding turn lanes, incorporating turning restrictions, consolidating accesses, and implementing traffic control measures. The goal of access management is to improve the safety, function, and operation of the roadway.

The following goals and basic strategies are used in implementing limited access control for this project:

- Limit the number of conflict points
- Separate conflict areas
- Remove turning vehicles from through traffic lanes
- Reduce conflicting volumes
- Improve roadway/driveway operations and safety

Based on these basic principles, access management guidelines were developed, which spelled out the approach that would be used in designating allowable access points. A plan was then developed showing each access on a set of arials, and this was presented to the public for their review and comments. The plan was then modified to accommodate additional access needs as brought forward in the public meetings.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT – There have been three open house meetings held jointly by MDT and the Consultant in East Helena; May 25, 26 and 27 at the East Valley Middle School. Beyond that, individual landowners have been able to approach MDT and the Consultant regarding their individual access concerns. This is an ongoing process that will continue through right of way negotiations.

NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION – A finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed by the Federal Highway Administration on March 16, 2004.

DISTRICT POSITION – The Great Falls District is in support of limited access for this project.

CITY/COUNTY POSITION – Lewis and Clark County has taken a position of support. Exhibit II is a letter from the Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners that states *"Lewis and Clark County Public Works, Planning and Transportation have reviewed the access plan and advise that this plan is an effective way to manage access along the corridor. We support this plan… Our principal concerns relate to maintaining the function of the roadway, reducing potential for congestion and reducing conflict points for added safety of the roadway. … Therefore we support your process to gain access control for STPHS 430-1(5)1."*

OPPOSITION – There is minimal public opposition to the access control, focused mainly on the wish to keep access points exactly as they currently exist. While this is not possible,

each landowner will end up with reasonable access to Canyon Ferry Road. Some access points will be eliminated.

EXHIBITS – The following exhibits are attached for Commission information and review:

Exhibit I:	An overall map of the area, showing the project limits.
Exhibit II:	A letter from the Lewis and Clark Board of County Commissioners in support of the access control.

Staff recommendations
Staff recommends approval.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

R E S O L U T I O N

DESIGNATION OF CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY AND FACILITY

PROJECT NO. STPS 430-1(5)1, UPN 4480
CANYON FERRY ROAD

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY, MONTANA.

The State of Montana Transportation Commission, in regular meeting assembled, does hereby concur in the following findings and resolution:

THAT a state highway known as Montana Department of Transportation highway project number STPS 430-1(5)1 has been approved for reconstruction by the Federal Highway Administration of the United States Department of Transportation, and federal funds will be expended to aid the state of Montana in the reconstruction of said highway;

THAT in order to facilitate the flow of traffic; preserve the public peace, health, and safety; for the promotion of the general welfare and efficient travel; and to otherwise facilitate implementation of the purposes and intents set forth in Montana Code Annotated §§ 60-1-101 and 60-1-102, the Montana Department of Transportation has recommended that any and all rights and/or easements of access claimed by the owners or occupants of land abutting said state highway should be controlled and/or limited by the state by exercise of its police power, or if it be determined that the police power does not apply to any parcel involved in this project, then the same should be acquired by eminent domain;

THAT the purpose of controlling access for said highway project number STPS 430-1(5)1 is to improve safety and efficiency by reducing vehicular conflicts;

THAT vehicular conflicts will be reduced by controlling and limiting the type and location of access points within the limits of said highway project number STPS 430-1(5)1;

THAT this commission has found and determined and does hereby find and determine that said Highway No. STPS 430-1(5)1, generally described as lying on Federal-aid Secondary 430, commonly known as Canyon Ferry Road, between reference point 1.0 located approximately 2.5 miles east of Custer Avenue separation on I-15 and reference point 9.2 at the junction of Secondary Highway 430 and Secondary Highway 284 (Spokane Creek Road) in Lewis and Clark County, Montana as shown on the right-of-way plans for said project No. STPS 430-1(5)1 and more specifically described on the "Description of Route" attached hereto and hereby made a part hereof, shall be designated as a "controlled access highway and facility";

THAT, pursuant to Montana Code Annotated § 60-5-103, this commission has found and determined and does hereby find and determine that it is necessary and desirable that the owners or occupants of abutting land or other persons shall have no easement of access or only a limited easement of access, light, air, or view so as to prevent such portion of highway from becoming unsafe for or impeded by unrestricted access of traffic from intersection streets, alleys, public or private roads, or ways of passage. In the event it is hereafter determined that the project shall leave any abutting landowner without reasonable access, then such rights of or easements to access, light, air, or view shall be acquired by the state; and

THAT there shall be no direct access to, from, or across the limits of said controlled access highway and facility, except as will be hereafter determined.

WE, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the above resolution was passed, adopted, and executed upon the favorable vote of at least three members of the State of Montana Transportation Commission at a meeting of said commission, held on the _____ day of _____, 20___.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 20_____.

STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

_____
Jim Lynch, Director
STATE OF MONTANA
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

_____
Shiell Anderson aka Shiell W. Anderson,
Chairperson

ATTEST:

_____
Lorelle M. Demont, Secretary

[COMMISSION SEAL]

STATE OF MONTANA)
):ss
LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY)

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the _____ day of _____, 20___, by Jim Lynch as director of the Montana Department of Transportation.

_____
_____, Notary Public
Residing at _____
My commission expires: _____

[NOTARIAL SEAL]

STATE OF MONTANA)
):ss
LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY)

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the _____ day of February, 20___, by Shiell Anderson aka Shiell W. Anderson as chairperson of the Montana Transportation Commission.

_____
_____, Notary Public
Residing at _____
My commission expires: _____

[NOTARIAL SEAL]

DESCRIPTION OF ROUTE
FOR
STPS 430-1(5)1
CANYON FERRY ROAD
IN
LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY, MONTANA

The route for Montana Department of Transportation Project STPS 430-1(5)1 begins on the centerline of Montana Secondary Highway 430 (S-430), RP 1.2, at a point located in the SE¼SE¼ of Section 15, Township 10 North, Range 3 West, P.M.,M., Lewis and Clark County, and extends easterly along said centerline a distance of 13.6 km (8.45 miles) over and across Sections 15, 22, 14, 23, 13 and 24, Township 10 North, Range 3 West; Sections 18, 19, 17, 20, 16, 21, 15, 22, 14, 23 and 13, Township 10 North, Range 2 West; and Section 18, Township 10 North, Range 1 West, P.M.,M., Lewis and Clark County, Montana, to a point of ending on centerline of Montana Secondary Highway 284 (S-284) in the SW¼NW¼ of said Section 18, RP 4.8, as the route for said Project STPS 430-1(5)1 has been located, surveyed, planned and designed by the Montana Department of Transportation.

By: RPA:trc Dated: 01/19/05
Ckd: Dated:

Agenda item: 02

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Review speed limit studies**

Background
Staff has performed traffic and engineering studies for the following:

a. Secondary 416 – Blue Creek Road (Yellowstone County)
b. MT 200 – Thompson Falls (Sanders County)
c. MT 16 – Sidney Northwest (Richland County)
d. US 12 – Helena West (Lewis & Clark County)

Please see the attachments for more detail.

Summary
The appropriate local government concurs with the recommendations put forth by MDT.

Staff recommendation
Staff recommends the commission approve the special speed zones as proposed.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Loran Frazier, P.E. – Acting Chief Engineer
Highways and Engineering Division

From: Duane E. Williams, P.E. - Traffic and Safety Engineer

Date: January 21, 2005

Subject: Secondary 416 – Blue Creek Road
Speed Limit Recommendation For Commission Action

- Yellowstone County requested a speed limit investigation on Blue Creek Road, Secondary 416 an extension of South Billings Boulevard. Blue Creek Road serves a rural residential area as well as the Blue Creek Elementary School. Residents are concerned that the existing speed limits maybe inappropriate for the level of development and type of activity in the area.

- Secondary 416 is a two-lane roadway with two 12-foot travel lanes and 6-foot shoulders. It was reconstructed in 1983 and improved in 1995. The vast majority of the development sets back from the roadway and is accessed via local roads that intersect Blue Creek Road with the exception of the school located next to the roadway at milepost 3.1. Previous speed limit investigations were conducted on this route in 1995 and 1998. This area has continued to experience additional development, and traffic operation has changed.

- The accident rate is 2.22 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled. This is above the statewide average of 1.73 accidents per million vehicle miles for rural secondary highways. Nearly all of the accidents occurred on the north end of the route within the 50 mph speed zone. There were no accidents reported within the school zone.

- The results of our investigation support the need to reduce the statutory 70 mph speed limit to 60 mph in order to align the speed limit configuration with traffic operation. Yellowstone County officials and the Billings District office reviewed the proposed recommendations on site. Yellowstone County has submitted written comments in support of the proposed 60 mph speed limit. They also requested the addition of a 45 mph advisory speed plate for a curve located within the 50 mph speed zone. The Billings District office has approved their request and will carry it out. The following 60 mph speed limits are recommended for Secondary 416.

- A 60 mph speed limit beginning at station 424+00, project S 132(6) (the end of the 50 mph speed zone approved in 1998) and continuing south to station 326+00, project RS 416-1(3), an approximate distance of 2.045 miles.

The 50 mph / 40 mph special school speed zone for the Blue Creek School will remain in effect as approved in 1996.

A 60 mph speed limit beginning at station 302+00, project RS 416-1(3) and continue south to station 284+00, an approximate distance of 1,800 feet.

Report Submitted to County Officials

In response to numerous calls and concerns voiced about the speed limit on Blue Creek Road Yellowstone County Commissioners requested a speed limit investigation and recommendations for changes if applicable. This investigation began near the South Billings Boulevard Interchange and continued south to the intersection with Vandaveer Road, an approximate distance of 4.4 miles. The study area consists of portions of both Urban Route 1013 and Secondary 416.

Blue Creek Road is a rural secondary highway that is an extension of South Billings Boulevard. It serves a rural residential area, as well as continuing south to an intersection with Prior Road. The intersection with Vandaveer Road is located at milepost 3.8 (Secondary 416) and marks the southern boundary of the majority of the residential development located in the surrounding environment. The vast majority of the development sets back from the roadway and is accessed via local roads that intersect Blue Creek Road. Of exception is the Blue Creek Elementary School located along the west side of the roadway near milepost 3.1. A previous speed limit investigation was conducted in 1995 establishing a special 50 mph speed zone in front of the school. With the 50 mph speed zone in place Yellowstone County officials invoked a school zone speed limit of 40 mph for the am and pm school crossing periods. The school zone speed limit is deployed through the use of 50 mph / 40 mph variable message speed limit signs equipped with bouncing ball flashing beacons.

In 1998 at the request of county officials the Department conducted a second study just south of the South Billings Boulevard Interchange. That study resulted in a 50 mph speed zone being established from the end of the existing 45 mph speed zone to a point south of the intersection with Hill Crest Road (mp 1.2). There are numerous intersections with local roads within this segment just south of the Yellowstone River as well as some commercial development. The remainder of the study area from Hill Crest Road to the school zone and south of the school zone is statutorily 70 mph. This area has experienced additional growth since our 1998 investigation.

The roadway was reconstructed in 1983 under project RS 416-1(3) and improved in 1995. The design speed is 50 mph. The typical section consists of two 12-foot travel lanes with 6-foot shoulders in each direction. There is a two-way-left-turn lane in the more densely developed area south of the Yellowstone River within the existing 50 mph speed zone. For the overall route the terrain is flat to rolling with a few horizontal curves.

Accident History

The accident experience was reviewed for three-year period from January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2003. During this period there were 31 accidents reported within the study area. The accident rate is 2.22 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled. This is above the statewide

average of 1.73 accidents per million vehicle miles for rural secondary highways. The following table lists the accident types by location.

	Angle	Rearend	Single Veh.	Other
Intersection	6	6	2	1
Non-intersection	0	2	13	1

Twenty-nine of the 31 accidents occurred between milepost 0.0 and milepost 2.0. Most of the conflicts within this segment fall within the boundaries of the existing 50 mph speed zone. There were no accidents reported from milepost 2.0 to milepost 3.3. The Blue Creek School is located within the accident free segment.

There are no definable accident trends that pinpoint a correctable condition.

Travel Speeds

Vehicular travel speeds were sampled at ten locations to develop a speed profile. The following table lists the 85th percentile speeds and the pace of the traffic stream by location beginning at the 45 mph to 50 mph speed limit transition and continuing south to the intersection with Vandaveer Road at milepost 3.8.

Location	85th percentile Speed	Pace of Traffic Stream & Percent
45 mph to 50 mph Transition	Northbound 51 mph Southbound 50 mph	41 mph – 51 mph (70%) 41 mph – 51 mph (66%)
Riverfront Park (50 mph zone)	Northbound 53 mph Southbound 54 mph	44 mph – 54 mph (67%) 44 mph – 54 mph (59%)
Just south of the River (50 mph zone)	Northbound 57 mph Southbound 51 mph	47 mph – 57 mph (63%) 41 mph – 51 mph (69%)
Quanta Lane (50 mph zone)	Northbound 51 mph Southbound 52 mph	41 mph – 51 mph (58%) 41 mph – 51 mph (60%)
50 mph to 70 mph Transition	Northbound 62 mph Southbound 57 mph	49 mph – 59 mph (56%) 46 mph – 56 mph (61%)

Location	85th percentile Speed	Pace of Traffic Stream & Percent
Near Marian Road	Northbound 65 mph	52 mph – 62 mph (48%)
(milepost 1.8)	Southbound 63 mph	52 mph – 62 mph (51%)
North of Briarwood Blvd.	Northbound 62 mph	46 mph – 56 mph (45%)
(milepost 2.2)	Southbound 61 mph	49 mph – 59 mph (54%)
South of Robindale Dr.	Northbound 67 mph	52 mph – 62 mph (48%)
(milepost 2.7)	Southbound 66 mph	55 mph – 65 mph (50%)
Blue Creek School Zone	Northbound 57 mph	44 mph – 54 mph (55%)
(50 mph / 40 mph)	Southbound 58 mph	47 mph – 57 mph (55%)
Vandaveer Road	Northbound 74 mph	58 mph – 68 mph (40%)
(milepost 3.7)	Southbound 65 mph	52 mph – 62 mph (47%)

Along the northern portion of the study area the 50 mph speed zone is functioning successfully in representing traffic operation from the intersection with the South Frontage Road to the intersection with Hill Crest Road. The 50 mph speed limit was just below the 85th percentile speeds at nearly every location sampled. There was also a reputable proportion of the traffic stream traveling within the pace along this segment.

From the end of the 50 mph speed zone to the Blue Creek School zone the 85th percentile speeds and the upper limit of the pace are consistently below the statutory 70 mph speed limit posted along this segment. A 60 mph speed limit would best reflect the trend in the travel speed statistics collected at four locations.

The 50 mph speed zone in front of the Blue Creek School is 7 mph to 8 mph below the 85th percentile speeds. Additional compliance in the 50 mph speed zone is desirable for effective operation. South of the Blue Creek School zone at the intersection with Vandaveer Road there is a 9 mph directional difference in the travel speeds. Furthermore, the pace of the traffic stream was identified as being 3 mph to 6 mph below the 85th percentile speeds at this location.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this investigation have identified that the existing 50 mph speed limit on the north end of the study area and the 50 mph / 40 mph special school speed limits are below the prevailing 85th percentile speeds typically used in setting speed limits. The 50 mph speed zone is right in line with traffic operation. However, additional compliance in the Blue Creek School speed zone is desirable.

As for the remainder of the study area it is functioning the safest with only two reported accidents in the last three years. The travel speeds along this segment are consistently well below the posted statutory 70 mph speed limit. A 60 mph speed limit would be just below the typical 85th percentile speeds and the upper limit of the pace. It would also maintain the preferred 10 mph incremental change in the speed limits to reflect traffic operation. Based on

the results of this investigation we recommend the following 60 mph speed limits for Blue Creek Road.

A 60 mph speed limit beginning at station 424+00, project S 132(6) (the end of the 50 mph speed zone approved in 1998) and continuing south to station 326+00, project RS 416-1(3), an approximate distance of 2.045 miles.

The 50 mph / 40 mph special school speed zone for the Blue Creek School will remain in effect as approved in 1996.

A 60 mph speed limit beginning at station 302+00, project RS 416-1(3) and continue south to station 284+00, an approximate distance of 1,800 feet.

DEW:DRB:TRF:s416rpt

attachments

copies: D.E. Williams
D.R. Bailey

Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Loran Frazier, P.E. – Acting Chief Engineer
Highways and Engineering Division

From: Duane E. Williams, P.E. - Traffic and Safety Engineer

Date: January 21, 2005

Subject: MT 200 – Thompson Falls
Speed Limit Recommendation For Commission Action

- In response to business owner's concerns about speed limits Sanders County officials in cooperation with the City of Thompson Falls requested an investigation on MT 200. Local officials informed us that the community has experienced additional commercial growth on the outskirts of town. They also felt that internal portions of the existing speed limit configuration were not structured to changes in the density of adjacent development.

- The portion of MT 200 that passes through the community of Thompson Falls was reconstructed in 1991 and improved in 1993. Thompson Falls is unique from most communities of comparable population in that the community is dispersed over a 4.4-mile segment of roadway. In recent years the community has continued to expand outward along MT 200.

- The accident rate for the last three years is 1.67 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled. This is exceptionally low for an urban type operational environment with on-street parking and numerous intersections and private approaches.

- In this investigation we identified that changes in the community have influenced the travel speeds in areas beyond the existing special speed limit configuration. Both the travel speeds and changes in the adjacent side culture also support the community's desire to revise the special speed limit configuration within the central part of town. We also identified that there were some discrepancies between the posted speed limits and the approved speed limit descriptions on record. In some cases we found that the existing speed limit sign locations were more logical from a motorist's perspective than the approved speed limits on record, and that the speed limit configuration should be adjusted to match site conditions. The following speed limit recommendations were presented to both Sanders County and the City of Thompson Falls. Both agencies have submitted written comments concurring with the proposed speed limit configuration.

  A new 55 mph speed limit beginning at station 567+00, project F 6-1(40) (1100 feet west of milepost 49) and continue east 587+00, an approximate distance of 2,000 feet.

  A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 587+00, project F 6-1(40) (350 feet west of bridge end) and continuing east to station 0+00, an approximate distance of 6,050 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 0+00, project F 6-1(23) (300 feet west of Pond Street) and continue east to station 12+00, an approximate distance of 1,200 feet.

The statutory 25 mph speed limit beginning at station 12+00, project F 6-1(23) (150 feet east of Lincoln Street) and continuing to station 49+00, an approximate distance of 3,700 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 49+00, project F 6-1(23) (east side of the intersection with Orchard Street) and continuing east to station 1124+00, an approximate distance of 950 feet.

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 1124+00, project STPP 6-1(48) (950 feet east of Orchard Street) and continuing east to station 1049+00, an approximate distance of 7,600 feet.

A new 55 mph speed limit beginning at station 1049+00, project STPP 6-1(48) (650 feet east of Woodline Lane) and continuing east to station 1026+00, an approximate distance of 2,300 feet.

Report Submitted to Local Officials

Sanders County officials and local business owners requested this investigation. Upon meeting with local officials we learned that there are two specific areas where a reduction in the speed limit is desired. The first area of concern is in front of the Les Schwab Tire shop located on the western edge of the community. This tire shop is located outside the existing special speed limit configuration. Local officials and employees both feel that the statutory 70 mph speed limit is inappropriate for the environment and the level of traffic generated by this business.

The second area of concern is located within the central portion of the community on the east side of the central business district between the intersections with Pine Street and Orchard Street. The speed limit changes from 25 mph to 35 mph at the intersection with Pine Street. Local officials have requested to extend the 25 mph speed limit east two blocks to the intersection with Orchard Street to encompass the remainder of the central business district. The south side of this portion of MT 200 is densely developed with specialty shops and other businesses. During our on site visit the area of concern was congested with motorists and parking activity.

The community of Thompson Falls is spread out over an approximate 4.4-mile segment of MT 200. The central portion of the community is the most densely developed with parallel and off-street parking along the north side of the MT 200 and angle parking along the south side. Nearly all of the development is located on the south side of the roadway. Immediately east and west of the central business district the development abruptly disperses for a distance and then concentrates again on the outer fringes of the community. A significant portion of the community is located outside of its incorporated boundaries.

This portion of MT 200 was reconstructed under project F 6-1(40) in 1991 and STPP 6-1(48) in 1993. Both projects have a design speed of 55 mph. The average annual daily traffic volume ranges between 1810 and 1960 at the extreme eastern and western edges of the study area to

5795 within the central portion of the community. There is also a designated school crosswalk within the 25 mph speed zone at the intersection with Mill Street. *"Diagonal Arrow" signs (W16-7p) should be added to the school crosswalk warning assembly at Mill Street.*

Accident History

The accident history was reviewed for a three-year period from January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2003. During this period there were 34 accidents reported within the study area. The accident rate is 1.67 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled. This accident rate is exceptionally low for this type of operational environment. The vast majority of the accidents were distributed throughout the study area with no identifiable trends pointing to a correctable condition. There were four single vehicle accidents located on the railroad overpass structure on the east end of Thompson Falls. One involved a conflict with a wild animal and the other three were associated with adverse roadway condition. There is guardrail along this segment. The following table lists the accident types by location.

	Angle	Rearend	Single Veh.	Other
Intersection	3	8	1	1
Non-intersection	4	1	10	6

Travel Speeds

Vehicular travel speeds were sampled at four locations to develop a speed profile approaching and through the community of Thompson Falls. The following table depicts the speed statistics at various locations beginning west of the Les Schwab Tire Shop and continuing east.

Location	**85th percentile Speed**	**Pace of Traffic Stream & Percent**
At the "Reduced Speed Ahead" sign	66 mph eastbound 63 mph westbound	(52 mph – 62 mph) 49% (52 mph – 62 mph) 52%
Location	**85th percentile Speed**	**Pace of Traffic Stream & Percent**
Milepost 49 50 mph Zone	58 mph eastbound 54 mph westbound	(43 mph – 53 mph) 50% (43 mph – 53 mph) 58%
Blue Slide Rd. 45 mph Zone	48 mph eastbound 55 mph westbound	(43 mph – 53 mph) 50% (43 mph – 53 mph) 58%
Milepost 50 45 mph Zone	52 mph eastbound 53 mph westbound	(41 mph – 51 mph) 70% (41 mph – 51 mph) 66%
45 mph to 35 mph Transition	41 mph eastbound 44 mph westbound	(32 mph – 42 mph) 57% (32 mph – 42 mph) 58%

35 mph to 25 mph	33 mph eastbound	(23 mph – 33 mph) 72%
Transition	34 mph westbound	(23 mph – 33 mph) 70%
Hill Street	26 mph eastbound	(17 mph – 27 mph) 82%
25 mph Zone	26 mph westbound	(17 mph – 27 mph) 85%
Milepost 52.3	46 mph eastbound	(34 mph – 44 mph) 71%
45 mph Zone	46 mph westbound	(34 mph – 44 mph) 73%
Milepost 53.2	49 mph eastbound	(37 mph – 47 mph) 65%
70 mph Zone	50 mph westbound	(37 mph – 47 mph) 61%

The existing speed limit configuration was established in November 1975. Overall, the posted speed limit configuration is reasonably accurate in reflecting traffic operation and the official speed limits as approved by the Montana Transportation Commission. There were few minor discrepancies noted in the posted locations. New businesses have prompted the changes in the posted speed limits and the need for some additional modification. The community boundaries have also expanded outward since 1975. The 85th percentile speeds are below the existing speed limits in the two specific areas of concern and on the extreme east end of the community. Additional motorist compliance in the 45 mph speed zone on the west end of the community would be desirable.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this investigation indicate that this segment of MT 200 is operating safely with a relatively few accidents for this type of environment. They also support local desires to modify the existing speed limit configuration to reflect traffic operation associated with changes in the adjacent environment. Beginning on the west end of the study area within the 50 mph speed zone near the Les Schwab Tire Shop the 85th percentile speeds ranged between 54 mph and 58 mph. West of Les Schwab the 85th percentile speeds (63 mph and 66 mph) were also notably below the statutory 70 mph speed limit. Based on the travel speeds in relationship to their location with the segment and the posted speed limits we recommend increasing the existing 50 mph speed limit to 55 mph and extend the boundaries of the zone westward to encompass the Les Schwab Tire Shop. Since a portion of this recommendation technically results in an increase we will definitely need Sanders County's written concurrence in order to carry this recommendation forward to the Montana Transportation Commission.

As for the 25 mph to 35 mph speed limit transition at the intersection with Pine Street it is our conclusion that both the travel speeds and the adjacent side culture support the community's request to reduce the 35 mph speed limit. The 85th percentile speeds within the 25 mph speed zone were 26 mph. The pace of the traffic stream was (17 mph – 27 mph) in both directions. Within the 35 mph speed zone at the true urban district boundary the 85th percentile speeds ranged between 33 mph and 35 mph. This places the 85th percentile speed profile between 26

mph and 33 mph – 35 mph in the area of concern. The pace of the traffic stream was also below 35 in both directions at the urban district boundary. The operational characteristics in terms of speed and the adjacent environment along this short segment of roadway are more consistent with those located within the 25 mph speed zone and the statutory urban district condition. The urban district is based on contiguous adjacent development.

The 85th percentile speeds do not directly support a 25 mph speed limit. However, based on the travel speeds located at the transition from one environment to another it is our conclusion that this segment meets the criteria to function successfully under the statutory 25 mph speed limit for an urban district. Relocating the 25 mph to 35 mph speed limit transition to the intersection with Orchard Street will align the speed limit configuration with changes in the density of adjacent development and on-street parking activity on MT 200.

In this investigation it was also identified that the existing special speed limit configuration on the east end of the study area does not encompass all of the nearby industrial development and numerous intersections and approaches. Particularly, in the eastbound direction the 85th percentile speeds and the upper limit of the pace are well below the statutory 70 mph speed limit. We also recommend the addition of a 55 mph speed zone for the transitional area from the end of the 45 mph speed zone to the railroad overpass. However, to carry the 55 mph speed limit over the railroad overpass would be quite restrictive.

In arriving at the actual speed limit recommendations for Thompson Falls we felt it would be logical to list the entire speed limit configuration. In addition to the changes outlined in the above conclusions we have made two minor (200 foot) adjustments in the official description to coincide with existing posted locations.

A new 55 mph speed limit beginning at station 567+00, project F 6-1(40) (1100 feet west of milepost 49) and continue east 587+00, an approximate distance of 2,000 feet.

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 587+00, project F 6-1(40) (350 feet west of bridge end) and continuing east to station 0+00, an approximate distance of 6,050 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 0+00, project F 6-1(23) (300 feet west of Pond Street) and continue east to station 12+00, an approximate distance of 1,200 feet.

The statutory 25 mph speed limit beginning at station 12+00, project F 6-1(23) (150 feet east of Lincoln Street) and continuing to station 49+00, an approximate distance of 3,700 feet.

A 35 mph speed limit beginning at station 49+00, project F 6-1(23) (east side of the intersection with Orchard Street) and continuing east to station 1124+00, an approximate distance of 950 feet.

A 45 mph speed limit beginning at station 1124+00, project STPP 6-1(48) (950 feet east of Orchard Street) and continuing east to station 1049+00, an approximate distance of 7,600 feet.

A new 55 mph speed limit beginning at station 1049+00, project STPP 6-1(48) (650 feet east of Woodline Lane) and continuing east to station 1026+00, an approximate distance of 2,300 feet.

Install the “Diagonal Arrow” signs (W16-7p) to complete the school crosswalk warning assemblies at the intersection with Mill Street.

The overall speed limit configuration is 4.507 miles in length.

DEW:DRB:TRF:p6thfallsrpt

attachments

copies: D.E. Williams
D.R. Bailey

Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Loran Frazier, P.E. – Acting Chief Engineer
Highways and Engineering Division

From: Duane E. Williams, P.E. - Traffic and Safety Engineer

Date: January 19, 2005

Subject: MT 16 – Sidney Northwest
Speed Limit Recommendation for Commission Action

- Richland County Commissioners requested a speed limit investigation for the purpose of removing a short 45 mph speed limit on a rural segment of MT 16 northwest of Sidney. The study area centers on the intersection with Secondary 201. Recent improvements to MT 16 through project NH 62-2 (18) have increased sight distance. Local officials felt that the restrictive 45 mph speed limit is longer necessary. This investigation was conducted with the 45 mph speed limit in place.

- This portion of MT 16 was reconstructed in 2003. The roadway consists of two 12-foot travel lanes with 7-foot shoulders in each direction. The east and west legs of the intersection (Secondary 201) are under stop sign control with a flashing beacon suspended over the intersection. Prior to reconstruction MT 16's vertical alignment restricted intersection sight distance. In an effort to align the travel speeds with the available sight distance a 45 mph speed limit was implemented in 1974.

- The results of this investigation identified that this is a rural intersection with no adjacent roadside development. The improvements to the roadway's alignment have increased intersection and stopping sight distances to a level that provides for safe and effective operation at 70 mph travel speeds. The prevailing 85th percentile speeds at the intersection were 68 mph and 69 mph. This newly reconstructed segment of roadway has not been in operation for a sufficient period of time in which to develop an accident history.

- Our findings support Richland County's request to reinstate the statutory 70 mph speed limit, as the 45 mph speed limit is not reflective of traffic operation or the roadway's design features. Richland County officials have submitted written comments that they are in favor of reinstating the statutory 70 mph speed.

- **We recommend removal of the 45 mph speed limit, Speed Zone #388 – Montana 16 & Secondary 201 as approved by the State Highway Commission in November 1974.**

Report Submitted to Local Officials

This segment of MT 16 was recently reconstructed under project NH 62-2(18). Upon completion of this project Richland County Commissioners requested that the 45 mph speed limit for the intersection of MT 16 with Secondary 201 be removed. They feel that since the intersection geometrics have been improved, the restrictive 45 mph speed limit is no longer necessary. This intersection is located in a rural environment northwest of Sidney. There is no adjacent development located in any of the intersection's four quadrants.

Prior to reconstruction MT 16's vertical alignment restricted intersection sight distance. The 45 mph speed limit was originally implemented in 1974 in an effort to align the travel speeds on MT 16 with intersection's geometric features and sight distance capabilities. From our files it was reported that in 1974 there were two angle accidents at this intersection resulting in ten individuals being injured. With the new alignment the available sight distance at this intersection exceeds the values necessary for effective operation at speeds of 70 mph. The design speed for the overall project is 60 mph.

The typical section is made up of two 12-foot travel lanes with 7-foot shoulders in each direction. The east and west legs of the intersection (Secondary 201) are under stop sign control with an overhead flashing beacon assembly to warn motorists of the intersection. This assembly is suspended on span wire and consists of flashing yellow signal heads for the north and south approaches (MT 16) and flashing red signal heads for the minor approach (Secondary 201).

Accident History

There has not been a sufficient period of time since reconstruction for this segment of roadway to develop an accident history in which to report on.

Travel Speeds

Vehicular travel speeds were sampled directionally at four locations. The travel speeds collected near the south end of the 45 mph speed zone were significantly higher than the remainder of the data set. Having no solid explanation for the variation in the travel speeds at this location, we omitted them from our analysis.

At the "Reduced Speed Ahead" sign south of the 45 mph speed zone the 85th percentile speeds were 66 mph northbound and 74 mph southbound. The pace of the traffic stream ranged between (52 mph – 62 mph) southbound and (58 mph – 68 mph) northbound with 33 percent to 39 percent of the traffic stream traveling within the pace.

At the intersection with Secondary 201 the 85th percentile speeds were 69 mph northbound and 68 mph southbound. The pace of the traffic stream ranged between (46 mph – 56 mph) and (49 mph – 59 mph) with 32 percent to 36 percent of the traffic stream traveling within the pace.

At the "Reduced Speed Ahead" sign north of the 45 mph speed zone the 85th percentile speeds were 69 mph in both directions. The pace of the traffic stream was (58 mph – 68 mph) in both directions with 35 percent to 38 percent of the traffic stream traveling within the pace.

The 85th percentile speeds at the intersection with Secondary 201 are consistent with those identified north and south of the 45 mph speed zone. The statutory 70 mph speed limit is also appropriate for the 85th percentile speeds identified. There is a significant variation in the pace of

the traffic stream at the intersection with Secondary 201 in that the upper limit of the pace is much lower than the 85th percentile speeds. We attribute this variation in the pace to the proportion of turning movements occurring at this intersection in relationship to the through moving volume on MT 16.

At this intersection MT 16 and Secondary 201 are similar in that both roadways have relatively low traffic volumes. The average annual daily traffic volume on MT 16 ranged between 730 north of the intersection with Secondary 201 to 1055 south of the intersection with Secondary 201. Where as the average annual daily traffic volume on Secondary 201 ranged between 480 west of MT 16 to 560 east of MT 16. The 45 mph speed limit is not consistent with the travel speeds and the surrounding environment. It may also be contributing to the wide range of travel speeds and the resulting lack of uniformity at this location.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This is a rural intersection with no adjacent roadside development. It is located a relatively significant distance from the nearest community. The 85th percentile speeds approaching and at the intersection are around 70 mph and indicate a rural operational character. The 45 mph speed limit is not representative of the operational characteristics on MT 16. It was originally established in an effort to address a safety issue associated with limited sight distance. With the new improvements to the roadway's alignment, intersection and stopping sight distances have been increased to provide safe and effective operation for the prevailing 85th percentile speeds associated with this environment. Therefore, the purpose in which the 45 mph speed limit was intended to fulfill no longer exists.

Based on the 85th percentile speeds and the roadway improvements we recommend proposing action to the Montana Transportation Commission to rescind the 45 mph speed limit and reinstate the statutory 70 mph speed limit as the official speed limit for this location. This is consistent with the desires outlined in Richland County's request.

DEW:DRB:TRF:mt16-s201rpt

attachments

copies: D.E. Williams
D.R. Bailey

Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Loran Frazier, P.E. – Acting Chief Engineer
Highways and Engineering Division

From: Duane E. Williams, P.E. - Traffic and Safety Engineer

Date: February 4, 2005

Subject: US 12 – Helena West
Speed Limit Recommendation For Commission Action

- The Representative of House District 82 in which this portion of US 12 is located originally requested a reduction in the speed limit on US 12 west of Helena. Lewis & Clark County officials were also in favor of having a study conducted in an effort to extend the 55 mph speed limit west to encompass all nearby residential development and the Broadwater Athletic Club. This study began within the existing 45 mph speed zone in front of the Kessler School and continued west to the intersection with Colorado Gulch Road.

- Since the Department had in recent history completed two previous studies on US 12, we opted to assign this request to an independent consulting firm. The purpose being to expedite the study and also gather a third party's perspective about traffic operation on US 12.

- US 12 consists of two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with 8-foot shoulders. There is curb & gutter in place out to the intersection with Old Broadwater Lane. Within this segment residential development is scattered along both sides of the roadway. The average annual daily traffic volume is 4770.

- For the last three years the overall accident rate was 2.88 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled. This is above the statewide average of 1.38 accidents per million vehicle miles traveled for rural NHS routes. As in previous investigations this investigation also identified that conflicts with wild animals are inflating the accident rate above statewide averages.

- Based on engineering criteria used to establish speed limits the consultant recommended a 65 mph speed limit from the end of the 55 mph speed zone near Lombardy Street and continuing west to just beyond the intersection with Old Broadwater Lane. For the remainder of the study area it was identified that the posted speed limits were below the 85th percentile speeds and the upper limit of the pace.

- The results of the investigation and the recommended 65 mph speed limit were presented to Lewis & Clark County staff. After some discussion about the concept of speed zoning and the operation of the roadway county staff concurred with the study results and forwarded the proposed 65 mph speed limit recommendation to the Lewis & Clark

County Commission. Lewis and Clark County Commissioners responded in writing that their constituents were dissatisfied with the results and requested a lower speed limit to reflect the nature of a residential environment. Upon receiving their comments a second meeting was scheduled to further discuss the county's request. From that meeting all parties arrived at a consensus to revise the 65 mph speed limit recommendation to 55 mph. County officials also pledged to step up enforcement in the area and may also through contact with the media inform motorists of the change in speed limit and the need to comply with it. In taking both the engineering and public issues into account we recommend the following 55 mph speed limit for US 12 – Helena West.

- **A 55 mph speed limit beginning at station 1146+00, project RTF 8-2(14) (the end of the existing 45 mph speed zone) and continuing west to station 1043+00, project FAP U249 – C (200 feet west of the intersection with Old Broadwater Lane), an approximate distance of 1.95 miles.**

DEW:DRB:TRF:us12westrpt

attachments

copies: D.E. Williams
D.R. Bailey

Agenda item: 03

Staff person handling: Lisa Durbin, Construction Admin. Services Bureau Chief

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Specification revision – allow option of submitting bid proposals electronically through the Internet**

Background

MDT's Contract Plans Bureau, in cooperation with the Montana Contractors' Association, requests that supplemental specification **Section 102 Bidding Requirements and Conditions** be revised to allow contractors to submit bid proposals electronically through the Internet. *This would be an optional method and would not be required.*

Contract Plans has been working with Info Tech to implement Bid Express, the Internet web application that contractors would use for Internet bid submission. Info Tech is the company that supports Bid Express and they are also the same company that provides support for the other AASHTO software modules in use by MDT. Bid Express has been proven to be a safe, secure and reliable format for contractors to submit bids electronically.

MDT and Info Tech have been working with the contracting community to provide training and testing. This training will continue as the process moves forward. The proposed specification changes would allow this new optional method of bid submission without interfering with the traditional method for those contractors that prefer not to change.

A draft of the proposed specification changes is attached. This draft has been sent out for review and comment internally to MDT personnel, to the Federal Highway Administration and to the Montana Contractors' Association for comment. It is anticipated that there will be some minor modifications to this draft proposal based on user comments.

Summary

Electronic Internet bidding will be an additional tool for contractors to submit proposals for construction projects throughout Montana. It will be an optional method, with no changes made to the traditional method of submitting bids. This concept has the support of many of the contractors throughout the state.

Staff recommendations

Staff recommends that these revisions to the supplemental specification be approved.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

MEMORANDUM

To: See Distribution

From: Mark Wissinger, P.E.
Construction Engineer

Date: January 6th, 2005

Subject: Supplemental Specification Revisions: 102.07 Bidding Requirements, 102.08 Rejection of Bid Proposals, 102.09 Proposal Guarantee, 102.10 Delivery and Public Opening of Proposals.

The Construction Administration Services Bureau is proposing revisions to Supplemental Specifications, 102.07 Bidding Requirements, 102.08 Rejection of Bid Proposals, 102.09 Proposal Guarantee, 102.10 Delivery and Public Opening of Proposals**.** Following the Standard Specification Revision Process outlined in the Construction Engineer's Memorandum dated January 9, 2002 the following information is provided.

1. Supplemental Specifications, 102.07 Bidding Requirements, 102.08 Rejection of Bid Proposals, 102.09 Proposal Guarantee, 102.10 Delivery and Public Opening of Proposals. will be modified.

2. The Proposed Draft of the change is attached along with this memorandum.

3. Revision to the Standard Specification is needed to include the option for the Contractor to use the Internet and Bid Express to submit Proposals.

4. Those impacted by the change include:
    - Contractors;
    - Contract Plans; and
    - Construction Administration.

5. The following individuals were consulted and/or involved in developing the proposed revisions:
    - Dan Smith, Specification Engineer
    - Lisa Durbin, CAS Bureau Chief
    - Steve Garrison, Helena Legal
    - Mark Wissinger, Construction Engineer
    - Suzy Althof, Contract Plans
    - Chris Clearman, Contract Plans

It is requested that comments on the proposed revisions be returned to the Specification Section no later than February 3rd, 2005.

DISTRIBUTION:
Loran Frazier
Jim Walther
Eng. Bureau Chiefs

District Administrators
Dist. Const. Engineers
MDT Legal

Construction Reviewers
FHWA
MCA

102.07 BIDDING REQUIREMENTS. Submit bids only using the Electronic Bid System (EBS) that generates the required Proposal, Schedule of Items, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) requirements, and indicates acknowledgement of addenda if applicable.

A. Distribution Procedures. The Department will make electronic bid files, and addendum files available to prospective bidders. Bidders may obtain EBS packages free of charge from the Departments Contractor System Internet Site, http://www.mdt.state.mt.us/contract/. Hardcopy bid packages are available for a fee from the Contract Plans Bureau.

B. Bidding Requirements.

Ensure bids submitted using the EBS format contain a Proposal guarantee, an EBS generated Proposal, Schedule of Items, and DBE requirements when applicable.

Ensure the EBS Schedule of Items is a single continuous printout for each individual bid, evidenced by all Schedule of Items sheets having the same check number. Written changes to the Schedule of Items, or a bidder's non-submission of every page from the Expedite Bid EBS file, (including all Schedule of Items pages and all DBE pages), automatically renders the bid non-responsive, and the bid will not be read or considered.

Acknowledge addenda using the amended EBS project file to generate the Proposal, Schedule of Items and DBE requirements. The printout indicates acknowledgment of receipt of addenda when the correct project file is used. Return a computer disk containing the complete project files for all projects bid with the bid package. It is the bidders responsibility to ensure that they acquire and apply addenda files when applicable.

C. Determination of Bid Responsiveness.

Bids are opened at the designated time and inspected to determine if the following requirements are met:

1. Schedule of Items: Unit Prices are provided for all required bid items. A complete and verifiable Schedule of Items is provided. Each sheet of the Schedule of Items must contain the same check number, to ensure that the unit bid prices correspond with the total. There are no written changes to the Schedule of Items.

2. Proposal Guarantee: The bid bond is on the most current version of the Department-furnished form; is signed and sealed in the proper places; a copy of the agent's Power of Attorney for the insurance company is attached; and contains the correct and complete project number; all signatures are original (stamped signatures are unacceptable). If using Bid Submission via Internet and Bid Express™, a qualified Surety Company must verify the contractor bond.

3. Addenda: All addenda are acknowledged by using the correct electronic file.

4. Proposal: Is signed and notarized in the designated places or in acceptable digital format; all signatures are original (stamped signatures are unacceptable).

A bid is non-responsive if any of the above requirements is not met.

For non-responsive bids, only the contractor's name, and the reason for the non-responsiveness determination, will be announced at the letting. The Department retains non-responsive bids.

Submission of a bid is a statement by the bidder that sufficient time was available to adequately prepare a Proposal and conduct a complete investigation of the work site and all contract documents.

102.08 REJECTION OF BID PROPOSALS. The Commission reserves the right to reject bid Proposals, waive technicalities, or advertise for new Proposals.

A Proposal is irregular and will be rejected as non-responsive if:

A. Failure to complete the bid bond or Proposal, provided by MDT, by all specified persons, including notaries, in the correct blocks.

B. There are unauthorized additions, conditional or alternate bids, or irregularities that make the bid package incomplete, indefinite, or ambiguous.

C. The Proposals for two or more projects advertised separately are connected or made contingent one upon the other so that the Proposal for one project carries a provisional deduction in the bid price on one or more of the other projects.

D. Any unauthorized provisions are added reserving the right to accept or reject an award or to enter into a contract pursuant to an award.

E. More than one Proposal for the same work from an individual, firm, corporation, partnership, or joint venture under the same or different name is submitted using the same format. (See subsection 102.10 (B) 6.)

F. Evidence of collusion among bidders exists. Participants in collusion will not receive recognition as bidders, either singly or as a joint venture, for future Department work until reinstated as qualified bidders.

G. Bidder fails to properly complete and sign, by original signatures, on the most current Department-furnished Proposal and bid bond forms. Stamped signatures are not authorized.
H. Failure to acknowledge receipt of electronic addenda by using the correct electronic files.
I. Failure to provide a complete Schedule of Items, or an unverifiable Schedule of Items. Each sheet of the Schedule of Items must contain the same check number, to ensure that the unit bid prices correspond with the total.
J. The bidder does not submit all pages from the Expedite Bid EBS file.

A bid Proposal is considered irregular and may be rejected as non-responsive if:
A. The Department-furnished Proposal is altered.
B. Bidder fails to include a name and mailing address.
C. The unit prices contained in the Proposal are obviously unbalanced, either in excess of or below the reasonable cost-analysis value.
D. Information entered in the Proposal by the bidder is not legible.
E. There are changes in the Proposal such as erasures, strikeouts, and whiteouts that are not initialed in ink.
F. Non-compliance with the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) requirements.
G. If Bid Express™ Software indicates an error, MDT will determine if the Proposal is non-responsive.

102.09 PROPOSAL GUARANTY. Make the Proposal guaranty unconditionally payable to the Department for no less than 10% of the Proposal. Provide the guaranty by bid bond with the Proposal. The guaranty must be a bid bond executed by a surety corporation authorized to do business in the State of Montana.

102.10 DELIVERY AND PUBLIC OPENING OF PROPOSALS. Bid Proposals are opened and read publicly at the place, time, and date specified in the "Invitation for Bids."

Deliver by the date and hour set for the opening of bid Proposals to the Department officials conducting the bid opening. Bid Proposals received after the specified time are returned to the bidder unopened.
The clock designated by the Department bid opening officials determines the bid opening time.
Do not submit bid Proposals by facsimile machines.

A Proposal not properly addressed and identified is returned to the bidder after it is opened.

A. Bid Submission by Sealed Envelope. Place the bid Proposal in a sealed envelope plainly marked to indicate the contents. Mail or deliver to: Montana Department of Transportation, Contract Plans Bureau, 2701 Prospect Avenue, P.O. Box 201001, Helena, Montana 59620-1001.

Mailed Proposals must be received by the Department's official conducting the bid opening before the bid opening time. The Contractor is solely responsible for the Proposal's delivery.

B. Internet Bid Submission via the Internet and Bid Express™. (Optional Bid Submission Procedure)

1. Access to the electronic bidding information is available on Bid Express™ at www.bidx.com and the MDT Contractors System Internet Site at http://www.mdt.state.mt.us/contract/.
2. When installing the Bid program, enter the vendor code that was issued by MDT. Before running the electronic bidding programs, read the on-line help documentation for the Expedite software.
3. Acknowledge all addenda in the electronic bid submitted.
4. "Joint Venture Bids" are currently not able to be submitted to Bid Express™.
5. Select **tools** and then **check bid** from the Windows Expedite menu to check the bid and ensure there are no errors prior to submitting the electronic bid. The electronic bid may be changed and resubmitted electronically to Bid Express™ as many times as desired before the advertised cutoff time. The last bid submitted for a given Bid opening as of the cutoff time will be the only bid considered. If a bidder chooses to submit Proposal using Bid Express™ and also submits a hard copy bid, the electronic copy of the bid will control.
6. Make no claim against the Department in the event it is unable to submit it's bid to Bid Express™ and/or Bid Express™ is unable to submit the bid(s) to the Department. The Department reserves the right to postpone or cancel the public opening and reading of bids in the event of internet, Bid Express™ or MDT technical difficulties.

Agenda item: 04

Staff person handling: Sandra Straehl, Rail, Transit and Planning Administrator

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Interstate maintenance projects in Missoula District**

Background
During the Tentative Construction Plan meetings in October 2004, the commitment was made to address the years 2008 and 2009 of the Interstate maintenance budget for the Missoula District. The Missoula District has now nominated four bridge rehabilitation projects on Interstate 90 to address these outer years of the Tentative Construction Plan. These projects are based on the Performance Programming Process (P^3) distributional analysis and were coordinated with Missoula District and Bridge Bureau staff.

Summary
The department has addressed public involvement by placing the list of proposed projects on the Internet and sending notice of the website to recipients of the *Newsline* and to members of the general public through governmental agencies whose addresses are in our agency's mailing database.

The list is consistent with funding analysis and distribution determined by P^3 approved by the commission in October 2004.

Project Name	*Route*	*Beg RP*	*Length*	*Scope*
St Regis Area Structures	I-90	29.2	10.1	Multiple Bridge Rehabs
Superior Area Structures	I-90	45.0	4.4	Multiple Bridge Rehabs
Lozeau-Tarkio Structures	I-90	53.7	8.1	Multiple Bridge Rehabs
Lothrop-Bearmouth Structures	I-90	77.6	60.7	Multiple Bridge Rehabs

Staff recommendations
Staff recommends the commission approve the addition of these projects to the program: $80,000 in partial preliminary engineering (par PE) through this STIP amendment. Full PE is estimated at $1,093,000 (this includes the $80,000 in partial PE).

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 05

Staff person handling: Sandra Straehl, Rail, Transit & Planning Administrator

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Three pavement preservation project nominations for 2006 (state-funded)**

Background
The districts were solicited for nominations of pavement preservation or reactive maintenance projects that could be let to contract in a timeframe to ensure contractor payout would occur before the end of the next state fiscal year (June 30, 2006.)

Project selection criteria for these nominations required verification with the Pavement Management System. Nominations were considered on any route that is maintained by the state, and include types of work that would not otherwise be eligible for Federal-aid.

Project Name	*Route*	*Beg RP*	*Length*	*Scope*
Rynesford-South	S-427	0.0	12.4	Mill, Overlay
Park City-Laurel	X-81015	0.0	6.7	Mill, Overlay
St. Xavier-N & S	S-313	22.0	7.02	Pulverize, Overlay

Summary
The department has addressed public involvement by placing the list of proposed projects on the Internet and sending notice of the website to recipients of the *Newsline* and to members of the general public through governmental agencies whose addresses are in our agency's mailing database.

Staff recommendations
Staff recommends the commission approve the addition of these projects to the state-funded construction program to be paid out during the 2005-2006 biennium.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 06

Staff person handling: Sandra Straehl, Rail, Transit & Planning Administrator

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Railroad crossing – surface improvement projects**

Background

Railroad crossing – Macon

Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) has requested the Montana Department of Transportation upgrade the crossing surface on MT 13 (P-32) approximately four miles east of Wolf Point. The improvement will be funded with Surface Transportation Primary funds (STPP). The existing concrete surface crossing is in very poor condition. Under this proposal MDT would replace the existing crossing surface with new concrete. The site is located in Roosevelt County on Primary 32, east of Wolf Point at RP 2.799. The estimated construction cost is $15,200 to MDT for materials only; BNSF will contribute the labor to construct the site as consistent with MDT policy.

Railroad crossing – Rouse Ave-Bozeman

Montana Rail Link (MRL) has requested the Montana Department of Transportation upgrade the crossing surface on Rouse Ave in Bozeman. MDT maintenance plans to overlay this section of Rouse Avenue this summer. There are three track crossings associated with this site. The improvement will be funded with STPP funds. The existing rubberized surface crossing is in poor condition. Under this proposal MDT would replace the existing crossing surface with concrete. The site is located in Gallatin County on Primary 86, Rouse Ave at RP 1.0. The estimated construction cost is $120,000 to MDT for materials only; MRL will contribute the labor to construct the site as consistent with MDT policy.

Summary

MDT has the opportunity to partner with BNSF and MRL in improving the above railroad crossings. MDT would pay for the materials ($135,200 combined) and the railroad would be responsible for construction. No project within the primary program will be impacted because of this expenditure.

Staff recommendations

Staff recommends the commission approve the addition of these two projects to the program.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 07

Staff person handling: Sandra Straehl, Rail, Transit & Planning Administrator

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Increase in project scope and cost**

Background
The following two projects fall within the guidelines for re-evaluation as described in commission policy 12, *Reapproving a project based on increase in scope and cost.*

STPHS 61-3(18)86, 2000 – Guardrail – 3 Km S. of Fergus Co. Ln. – S
The original estimated cost of this project was $322,000. Following the plan-in-hand review, the cost was increased to $611,000. The increase in project cost was a result of a modification to the construction material.

- The project was originally identified to be constructed utilizing W Beam guardrail.
- Following the plan-in-hand review, it was decided that Box Beam guardrail was needed to prevent snow drifting onto the road.
- This location is a high-risk location for snow drifting and accumulation. The W Beam guardrail tends to act as a snow fence, while the Box Beam guardrail has a more open structure and does not.
- The current cost of Box Beam guardrail is double that of W Beam guardrail.

This additional project cost is currently fundable thus no adjustments to the Tentative Construction Plan are necessary to maintain a balanced program.

STPP 27-2(13)23, Baker – South
This project was originally nominated in 1999 at an estimated cost of $5.8 million. Following the preliminary field review, the decision was made to extend the limits of the project by 5.5 kilometers, which increased the project cost to $8.5 million.

The current cost estimate for the project is estimated at $10.5 million, based on several factors:

- Inflation and increasing oil prices can account for a large portion of the increase
- Expanded scope of work: not only did the length change, but also the surfacing width went from 8.4 to 9.2 meters.

  The expanded surfacing width was necessary to accommodate the future level of service anticipated in the area and to accommodate future overlays.

In order to account for the additional cost of the project and to maintain a balanced Tentative Construction Program, the Glendive district administrator has opted to move *Forsyth-Northwest*, STPP 14-6(10)259 ($8,107,400) to FFY 2008 and consider splitting *Redstone-E&W* STPP 22-1(11)15 with $11, 979,000 expended in FFY 2008 and $3,021,000 in

FFY 2009. These decisions will be brought to the commission to be formalized during the next TCP meeting in the fall of 2005.

Summary
Due to the expansion of the scope of work and the resulting cost increases, these projects need to be reconsidered by the commission. A copy of policy 12 is attached.

Staff recommendations
Staff recommends the commission approve the expanded scope of work for STPHS 61-3(18)86 and STPP 27-2(13)23 at the current estimated cost of $611,000 and $10.5 million respectively.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

****

MONTANA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
POLICY STATEMENT

Adopted by the Montana Transportation Commission
during regular session on December 10, 2004

Policy Number: **12**
Subject: **Reapproving a project based on increase in scope and cost**

****

Background

The commission approves the inclusion of all projects into the transportation program administered by the department. Projects at this stage are only generally defined. As a project is developed and more detailed information is available, there may be a significant increase in cost because of a change of scope beyond that which was originally proposed to and approved by the commission. In such cases, staff must bring that project back to the commission for reapproval.

Purpose

The purpose for this policy is to define the parameters by which the Montana Department of Transportation will bring a project back to the commission for reapproval.

Procedures

1. Any commission-approved project that experiences an increase in project cost prior to contract award as a result of an increase in the scope of work must be taken back to the Transportation Commission for their approval if the cost violates the following sliding scale:

Project cost	Percent increase in project cost
Less than $100,000	30%
Between $100,000 and $500,000	25%
Between $500,000 and $1 million	20%
Between $1 million and $2 million	15%
Greater than $2 million	10%

2. Project cost increases not meeting this test shall be considered incidental to the overall project cost and will not be presented to the Transportation Commission for their approval; rather, staff will follow the program modification procedures currently in place.

Agenda item: 08

Staff person handling: Sandra Straehl, Rail, Transit & Planning Administrator

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Great Falls south arterial**

Background
On October 2, 2001, Great Falls and MDT entered into an agreement to retain a consultant to conduct the Great Falls Arterial Feasibility Study. The agreement was modeled after a similar agreement for the Billings Bypass Feasibility study that led to the environmental assessment that is currently under development for the Billings Bypass. The Great Falls Study was funded through a combination of local and Montana Air and Congestion Initiative (MACI)-Guaranteed Program funds.

The purpose of the Great Falls Arterial Feasibility Study was to evaluate the economic and engineering feasibility of a proposed arterial route connecting Interstate 15 west of Great Falls with Montana Highway 3 (US Highway 87/89) east of Great Falls. The study considered both north and south alignments and recommended a south alignment beginning at Interstate 15 near the Airport Interchange south of Great Falls, extending easterly for approximately 8.1 miles to a junction with Montana Highway 3, east of Great Falls. The proposed corridor would replace 10th Avenue South as a segment of the Camino Real High Priority Trade Corridor (see attached map).

The Great Falls – MDT agreement governing the development of the study includes a provision that development of the corridor would continue under MDT's direction if the new arterial proved feasible and was approved by the Transportation Commission. This commitment is consistent with the approach taken in developing the Billings Bypass and appropriate, as the corridor, once developed, would be designated onto Montana's portion of the National Highway System (NHS) (**Note**: if MDT proceeds toward designation, other NHS links within Great Falls will have to be re-designated).

If approved by the commission, these commitments would include advocacy for discretionary funds to develop the corridor, management of environmental review and future preliminary engineering and construction, and the use of state funds to match any discretionary or directed funding from Congress if match is required. There is no commitment in the agreement to use core highway-program funds to develop this corridor. If the commission approves this action, staff will include the Great Falls south arterial in future lists of projects the state is seeking congressional funding to advance.

MDT staff has reviewed the study and agrees with its conclusions.

Summary
The Great Falls Arterial Feasibility Study was completed and distributed in March of 2004. Consistent with a Great Falls – MDT agreement, commission approval is now needed to allow MDT to seek special funding and take the lead in developing the project.

Feasibility Study Executive Summary
The feasibility study evaluated the engineering and economic feasibility of both a northern and southern corridor alignment and provided a first level environmental screening for a variety of alternatives ranging from four-lane freeways to rural two lane arterial facilities. The study demonstrated that compared to a "no-build" alternative, a southern corridor is feasible and preferred based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Guidelines for Highway Feasibility Studies and specifically feasible from:

- An economic perspective through favorable benefit/cost ratio
- An engineering perspective that standard project development and design procedures will adequately identify and address any engineering issues
- An environmental perspective by identifying no "fatal flaws" that could preclude further development
- A traffic perspective by improving safety and reducing congestion
- A community perspective that the bypass is consistent with community goals and plans and fulfills recommendations made by local planning documents and policies.

The study also "technically recommended" a proposed alternative on a southern aligned corridor designed as a four-lane urban arterial facility. Copies are available from the Planning Division.

Staff recommendations
Staff recommends approval for MDT to pursue federal discretionary funding for continued MDT-led project development of the South Arterial project in Great Falls including a location study, preparation of an environmental document, project design and eventual construction. However, each phase will require separate commission action.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 09

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Lincoln Road/I-15 interchange safety improvement project**
IM 15-4(91)200 [CN 4815] – design-build pilot project #2

Background
The Lincoln Road/I-15 Interchange was selected to be the second of three pilot projects using the design-build process. Following are the results of the selection process, along with a recommendation for award.

The request for qualifications (RFQ) package was advertised on August 23, 2004. Statement of qualifications (SOQ) responses were received from five design-build teams (firms) on October 7, 2004. A technical review committee (TRC) consisting of nine MDT staff members from various project-related disciplines independently evaluated and scored the SOQ of the five teams based on established evaluation criteria and scoring guide.

One firm was considered non-responsive because its SOQ exceeded the maximum page limit required by the RFQ. The TRC produced a ranked short list of three teams that were invited to submit proposals. Request for proposal (RFP) packages were issued to the three short-listed firms on November 15, 2004 with technical proposal responses due on December 17, 2004 and bid price proposal responses due on January 10, 2005. The following is a summary of the proposal evaluation process and resulting recommendation.

Proposal summary and selection committee recommendation:
Three sealed technical proposals were received on December 17, 2004 and three sealed bid price proposal packages were received and publicly opened at 10 am on January 10, 2005. Proposals were received from the following firms:

- Construction Solutions, Inc./Kadrmas Lee & Jackson/Tamietti Construction/SK Geotechnical
- Dick Anderson Construction, Inc./Stahly Engineering & Associates
- Frontier West, LLC/Morrison Maierle, Inc.

The TRC evaluated and scored the written technical proposals submitted by each firm prior to opening the bid price proposals. This score was based on evaluation criteria and scoring guideline provided in the RFP package (copy attached). All technical proposals were independently scored and tabulated before the bid price proposals were opened.

Contract Plans Bureau publicly opened the sealed bid price proposals at 10 am, January 10, 2005. Contract Plans Bureau and the design-build engineer divided each firm's total bid price amount by the technical proposal total score provided by the TRC to obtain an adjusted score. The lowest adjusted score is considered the best value proposal. Contract Plans

Bureau and the design-build engineer provided the adjusted score and supporting information for each firm to the selection committee.

The following formula was used to determine the adjusted score for each firm:

$$\text{Adjusted score} = \frac{\text{bid price proposal amount (\$)}}{\text{technical proposal total score}}$$

The selection committee (Mark Wissinger, Construction Engineer; Mick Johnson, Great Falls District Administrator; and Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer) reviewed the bid price proposals and technical proposal evaluation and scoring information provided by the TRC. The following is a summary of the proposal results:

Firm	*Bid price proposal amount*	*Technical proposal total score*	*Adjusted score (best value)*
Dick Anderson Construction, Inc./Stahly Engineering & Associates	$1,344,307.85	36,124	37.214
Frontier West, LLC/ Morrison Maierle, Inc.	$2,050,000.00	44,668	45.894
Construction Solutions, Inc./Kadrmas Lee & Jackson/ Tamietti Construction/ SK Geotechnical	$1,897,000.00	40,510	46.828

After reviewing the technical proposal Evaluation and Scoring information provided by the TRC and the bid price proposals, the selection committeeheld a meeting with Dick Anderson Construction, Inc. and asked the following question:

> **Since the technical proposal submitted by Dick Anderson construction, Inc. did not provide for 2-lane, 2-way traffic across the bridge during hours of darkness in Phase I-B of the traffic control plan as required by the RFP, how does Dick Anderson Construction, Inc. propose to address this issue?**
> Dick Anderson Construction, Inc. responded via e-mail on 01/14/05 that the firm proposed to address the issue by revising their scope of work to comply with the RFP and increasing their bid price proposal to $1,797,807.04 (an increase of $453,499.19 over their original bid price proposal amount).

The selection committeereviewed evaluation criteria #6 response by Frontier West, LLC regarding claims history. Section 6 of the technical proposal states: **"During 2002, 2003 and 2004, neither Frontier West, LLC nor Morrison-Maierle, Inc. has had any claims that have gone to litigation."** However, the RFP asked for information on all members of the firm for the years 2001 (which was not addressed), 2003 and 2003. It also asked for an explanation of any claim of $50,000 or more that and firm member had on project during those years. The selection committee obtained information that shows Frontier West, LLC

was involved in one MDT project claim that was still in litigation in 2001 and is currently involved in another MDT project claim that was filed in 2003 and is still pending. Both claims exceeded $50,000.

Since all three bid price proposals exceeded the original engineer's cost estimate of $1,024,350 by more than 25%, the TRC was directed to review the scope of work and original cost estimate. After review of the original cost estimate, item costs were updated and discovered errors were corrected that resulted in substantial cost increases. The original cost estimate was subsequently revised to $1,675,550.00 (copy attached), which is within 25% of the total bid price proposal amounts of all proposing firms.

Summary

- Dick Anderson Construction, Inc. proposal was determined to be non-responsive to the RFP.

- Dick Anderson Construction, Inc. is not eligible for the stipend payment.

- Frontier West, LLC proposal was found to contain irregularities and determined to be non-responsive for the following reasons:
  1) Did not provide the calendar years specified in the RFP.
  2) Did not identify MDT projects claims in calendar years 2001 and 2003.
  3) Did not identify all claims over $50,000 as required by the RFP, not just those having gone to litigation.

- Frontier West, LLC is not eligible for the stipend payment.

Staff recommendations

Based on review of the options, the selection committee recommends the commission award the contract to the Construction Solutions, Inc. team, with the lowest adjusted score considered the best value for MDT, in the amount of $1,897,000.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 10

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Letting lists**

Background
Staff will distribute the most current lists of upcoming projects slated for advertisement and bid letting.

Staff recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the letting lists.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 11

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Certificates of completion**

Background
Attached are certificates of completion for November and December of 2004.

Summary

Month	*Original contract amount (monthly total)*	*Final payment amount (monthly total)*
November	$32,081,559	$34,531,271
December	$16,478,303	$16,848,364
Total	$48,559,862	$51,379,635

Staff recommendation
Staff recommends approval.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 12a

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Liquidated Damages**
STPP 56-1(3)0 *Bull Lake - S*

Background
JTL Group, Inc. of Kalispell, MT, overran the contract time by 32 days. We wrote the contractor on October 1, 2004 of the overrun of contract time. They were informed they had 30 days in which to respond if they intend to request a waiver from the commission. They were also informed that if a written reply was not received within 30 days, the liquidated damages would stand. As there was no response from the contractor, our recommendation is noted below.

Summary

Award date:	Feb 20 2002	Proceed date:	Mar 25, 2002
Work began:	Apr 1, 2002	Work completed:	Aug 12, 2003
Contract time:	120 working days	Work extensions:	45 days
Time used:	197 days	Overrun:	32 days
Total contract Amt:	$5,421,263		

Staff recommendations
We recommend assessing 32 days at $1818.00 per day for a total of $58,176.00

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 12b

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Liquidated Damages**
STPHS-IM 0002(627) *1998 –D3- Electrical*

Background
United Rentals, Inc. of Missoula, MT, overran the contract time by 1 day. We wrote the contractor on October 1, 2004 of the overrun of contract time. They were informed they had 30 days in which to respond if they intend to request a waiver from the commission. They were also informed that if a written reply was not received within 30 days, the liquidated damages would stand. As there was no response from the contractor, our recommendation is noted below.

Summary

Award date:	Feb 2, 2003	Proceed date:	Mar 10, 2003
Work began:	Apr 29, 2003	Work completed:	Oct 3, 2003
Contract time:	45 Working Days	Work extensions:	2 days
Time used:	48 days	Overrun:	1 day
Total contract amt:	$331,818		

Staff recommendations
We recommend assessing 1 day at $673.00 per day for a total of $673.00

Notes/discussion

Commission action

Agenda item: 13

Staff person handling: Loran Frazier, Acting Chief Engineer

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Change orders**

Background
Attached are change orders for November and December 2004.

Summary

Month	**Total**
November 2004	$1,281,577.71
December 2004	$538,466.67
	$1,820,044.38

Staff recommendation
Staff recommends approval.

Notes/discussion

Commission action

SUMMARY OF WORK ORDER TOTALS **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

MISSOULA DISTRICT	$ 184,578.50
BUTTE DISTRICT	51,371.16
GREAT FALLS DISTRICT	24,304.00
GLENDIVE DISTRICT	143,495.43
BILLINGS DISTRICT	877,828.62
MONTH'S TOTAL	$ 1,281,577.71

SHEET NO. 1 OF 3 **DISTRICT MISSOULA** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH 5-3(66) 109 F Ashley Creek-Kalispell Work Type 130	JTL Group, Inc. - Kalispell Kalispell, MT			C.O. No. 5 implements a Contractor Value Engineering Proposal per the terms of MDT Standard Specification Article 104.08. The VE proposal will increase the spacing of the longitudinal tie-bars by 462 mm (18 inches) and eliminate the longitudinal joint between the driving lane and bike path on typical sections 6 and 7.
	Engr's Est.	$13,704,851.62		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$14,344,308.03	$(28,530.89)	
	Total W.O.'s	$343,519.11		
	Total	$14,687,827.14		
NH 5-3(66)109 F Ashley Creek-Kalispell Work Type 130	JTL Group, Inc.- Kalispell Kalispell, MT			C.O. No. 7 provides for lowering the 300 mm water main and fire hydrant supply legs due to conflicts with the storm drain system. The costs to lower the water pipes will be paid at agreed prices. The work to lower the new water main and hydrant supply legs will be paid 100% with city of Kalispell funds.
	Engr's Est.	$13,704,851.62		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$14,344,308.03	$146,900.46	
	Total W.O.'s	$490,419.57		
	Total	$14,834,727.60		

SHEET NO. 2 OF 3 **DISTRICT MISSOULA** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH-PLH 7-1(93)68 F North of Stevensville Wye-Florence Work Type 130	Schellinger Const. Co., Inc. Columbia Falls, MT			C.O. No. 5 provides for 13,000 cubic meters of additional traffic gravel to be paid at contract bid price. The additional traffic gravel is needed because frequent switching of traffic for various grading operations.
	Engr's Est.	$11,787,897.75		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$10,836,412.66	$169,000.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$590,054.74		
	Total	$11,426,467.40		
CM 12003(2) 7th-Karrow to Baker-Whitefish Work Type 181 *Tied to CM 12004(2)* *Karrow-2nd-7th-Whitefish*	Schellinger Construction Co., Inc. Columbia Falls, MT			C.O. No. 1 provides for terminating the planned Contract work. The Flathead County Road and Bridge Department seal coated the project roadway after the project was awarded and prior to the Pre-construction conference. Per Standard Specification 108.10.2 the allowable termination costs will be paid to the Contractor at agreed price. All work will be deleted at contract bid prices.
	Engr's Est.	$111,816.70		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$106,136.00	$(91,748.41)	
	Total W.O.'s	$(91,748.41)		
	Total	$14,387.59		

SHEET NO. 3 OF 3 **DISTRICT MISSOULA** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
CM 12004(2) Karrow-2nd to 7th – Whitefish Work Type 181 *Tied to CM 12003(2) 7th-Karrow to Baker-Whitefish*	Schellinger Construction Co., Inc. Columbia Falls, MT Engr's Est. Orig. Contr. Amt. Total W.O.'s Total	 $111,816.70 $106,136.00 $(11,042.66) $95,093.34	 $(11,042.66)	C.O. No. 1 provides for terminating the planned Contract work. The Flathead County Road and Bridge Department seal coated the project roadway after the project was awarded and prior to the Pre-construction conference. Per Standard Specification 108.10.2 the allowable termination costs will be paid to the Contractor at agreed price. All work will be deleted at contract bid prices.

MISSOULA DISTRICT TOTAL $184,578.50

SHEET NO. 1 OF 3 **DISTRICT BUTTE** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
IM 15-2(74)122 Rocker Scale Site Work Type 111 *Tied to STPS 276-1(70)* *Rocker Interchange - N*	Jim Gilman Excavating, Inc. Butte, MT Engr's Est. Orig. Contr. Amt. Total W.O.'s Total	 $5,020,537.68 $4,257,148.19 $35,703.49 $4,292,851.68	 $14,667.45 	C.O. No. 5 provides for supplying and delivering telecommunication equipment that is needed to tie the new Rocker Scale with the Butte District Office Complex. The MDT Communications Bureau will install the telecommunication equipment. The telecommunications equipment will be paid for at agreed price.
IM 15-3(65)134 Butte-Elk Park Structures Type 231	Sletten Construction Co. Great Falls, MT Engr's Est. Orig. Contr. Amt. Total W.O.'s Total	 $975,967.05 $765,430.40 $16,391.94 $781,822.34	 $16,391.94 	C.O. No. 3 provides for washing epoxy coated reinforcing steel that was stored on the project site and for tying the reinforcing steel in place. The costs to wash and tie the reinforcing steel will be paid at agreed prices. Also, it has been determined that additional epoxy coated reinforcing steel and epoxy coated bar supports are needed. The additional epoxy coated reinforcing steel, epoxy coated bar supports and shipping will be paid at agreed prices with state funds.

SHEET NO. 2 OF 3 **DISTRICT BUTTE** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
SFCS 294-1(6)0 JCT US 89-Martinsdale Work Type 181	Riverside Contracting, Inc. Missoula, MT			C.O. No. 6 provides for eliminating cold milling work planned for typical section 2. The existing sub surfacing was not adequate to support construction equipment and the planned typical section width requirements were met without milling the existing plant mix. The additional milling expenses incurred by the Contractor and the reduced quantity of cold milling needed will be paid at agreed prices. The unused planned quantity of cold milling will be deleted at contract bid price.
	Engr's Est.	$1,840,821.48		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$1,775,891.93	$(49,424.08)	
	Total W.O.'s	$80,323.44		
	Total	$1,856,215.37		
IM 115-2(8)0 Butte-West Work Type160	Jim Gilman Excavating, Inc. Butte, MT			C.O. No. 1 provides for extending the project seal and cover work from Station 144+07 eastward by 0.87 kilometers to the Intersection of Iron Street and Montana Street. Modifying the project limits to tie the planned seal and cover work into adjacent streets has been approved by the FHWA and agreed to by the MDT Fiscal Programming Bureau. The numerous items of work needed include Gr. 4A cover material, CRS-2P emulsified asphalt, traffic control and different types of pavement markings that will be paid at contract bid prices.
	Engr's Est.	$1,257,153.17		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$976,423.19	$29,834.15	
	Total W.O.'s	$29,834.15		
	Total	$1,006,257.34		

SHEET NO. 3 OF 3 **DISTRICT BUTTE** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR NOVEMBER**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
CM 1805(10) Montana & Rowe Road-Butte Work Type 410	Hollow Contracting Butte, MT			C.O. No. 4 provides for extending the project seal and cover work from Station 3+00 northward on Montana Street by 0.5 kilometers. Modifying the project limits to tie the planned seal and cover work into the adjacent roadway has been approved by the FHWA and agreed to by the MDT Fiscal Programming Bureau. The numerous items of work needed include Gr. 4A cover material, CRS-2P emulsified asphalt, traffic control and different types of pavement markings that will be paid at contract bid prices.
	Engr's Est.	$755,471.30		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$620,067.89	$39,901.70	
	Total W.O.'s	$39,901.70		
	Total	$659,969.59		

BUTTE DISTRICT TOTAL $51,371.16

SHEET NO. 1 OF 1 **DISTRICT GREAT FALLS** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH-CM 60-2(62)91 10th Ave South-26th to 38th Great Falls Work type 160	United Materials of Great Falls Great Falls, MT			C.O. No. 3 provides for adding Gr. C (commercial) plant mix bituminous surfacing for making connections between the sidewalks and parking lots. Millings were to be used to make recycled plant mix to complete the connections but there were not sufficient millings to complete the recycled plant mix. The needed Gr. C plant mix will be paid for at agreed price.
	Engr's Est.	$1,592,316.41		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$1,937,326.38	$11,200.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$16,600.00		
	Total	$1,953,926.38		
NH-CM 60-2(62)91 10th Ave South-26th to 38th Great Falls Work Type 160	United Materials of Great Falls Great Falls, MT			C.O. No. 4 provides for adding yellow curb marking paint to complete the interim curb markings. The interim curb paint painting needed will be paid for at agreed price. Also, the third paragraph of Standard Specification 620.03.3.C to allow concrete curbs to cure for 30 days before painting will be deleted since final pavement markings will be applied in the Spring.
	Engr's Est.	$1,592,316.41		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$1,937,326.38	$13,104.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$29,704.00		
	Total	$1,967,030.38		

GREAT FALLS DISTRICT TOTAL $24,304.00

SHEET NO. 1 OF 2 **DISTRICT GLENDIVE** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 18-2(14)31 Rock Springs-North and South Work Type 140	MK Weeden Construction, Inc. Lewistown, MT			C.O. No. 3 provides for using select grading material approved by the MDT Project Manager in the top 0.6 meters of fill between stations 41+00 and 60+00. Subgrade material that was planned to be placed on top of the fill was found to be unsuitable. The quantities of geotextile high survivability fabric and select grading material needed to complete the earthwork between stations 41+00 and 60+00 will be paid for at agreed prices.
	Engr's Est.	$7,996,838.41		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,725,914.52	$27,745.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$(18,862.57)		
	Total	$8,707,051.95		
STPP 22-1(7)8 Flaxville-East and West Work Type 140	MK Weeden Construction, Inc. Lewistown, MT			C.O. No. 6 provides for installing geogrid as recommended by the Geotechnical Section and Construction Bureau at locations not shown on the plans. The geogrid needed to reinforce areas of subgrade will be paid at contract bid prices.
	Engr's Est.	$3,982,292.98		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$4,064,873.88	$76,170.83	
	Total W.O.'s	$151,625.25		
	Total	$4,216,499.13		

SHEET NO. 2 OF 2 **DISTRICT GLENDIVE** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 22-1(7)8 Flaxville-East and West Work Type 140	MK Weeden Construction, Inc. Lewistown, MT			C.O. NO. 7 provides for about 50,000 units of traffic control devices. The additional units of traffic control devices will protect the traveling public through the construction zones and protect project construction personnel so the project work can be safely completed. The additional quantity of traffic control will be paid at $0.80 per unit as specified by Contract Special Provision 28.
	Engr's Est.	$3,982,292.98		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$4,064,873.88	$39,579.60	
	Total W.O.'s	$191,204.85		
	Total	$4,256,078.73		

GLENDIVE DISTRICT TOTAL $143,495.43

SHEET NO. 1 OF 4 **DISTRICT BILLINGS** **MONTH BILLINGS** **YEAR NOVEMBER**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 45-1(17)8 13 km North of Big Timber-North Work Type 140	MA Deatley Construction Clarkston, WA			C.O. No. 5 provides for additional PG 64-28 asphalt cement. The actual percentage of asphalt cement used was 6.2% of the plant mix volume, while the plans estimated the AC at 5.1% of the plant mix volume. The additional PG 64-28 AC is required to meet the desired plant mix requirements set forth in the special provisions for density acceptance by cores and ride specifications for flexible pavement. The additional quantity of PG 64-34 AC needed will be paid at contract bid price. Two loads of PG 70-28 will also be used instead of PG 64-34 and will be paid for at agreed price.
	Engr's Est. Orig. Contr. Amt. Total W.O.'s Total	$8,512,475.75 $8,904,835.70 $318,781.80 $9,223,617.50	$136,695.51	
STPP 45-1(17)8 13 km North of Big Timber-North Work Type 140	MA Deatley Construction Clarkston, WA			C.O. No. 6 provides for additional traffic gravel. This additional traffic gravel is needed due to the clay soils sandy/silt and decomposed shale encountered during the construction of the subgrade. Also a 50 mm layer of traffic gravel will be placed on top of the subgrade to provide a stable and uniform base for the cement treated base course. The additional traffic gravel needed will be paid at contract bid price.
	Engr's Est. Orig. Contr. Amt. Total W.O.'s Total	$8,512,475.75 $8,904,835.70 $480,781.80 $9,385,617.50	$162,000.00	

SHEET NO. 2 OF 4 **DISTRICT BILLINGS** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 45-1(17)8 13 km North of Big Timber-North Work Type 140	MA Deatley Construction Clarkston, WA			C.O. No. 7 provides for 140,000 units of traffic control devices. The additional quantity of traffic control will be at the agreed price of $0.80 per unit as specified per Special Provision 47. The additional units of traffic control are needed at intersections/side roads and to maintain public safety during the contractors various operations. Additional traffic control devices were needed during the periods when dust control measures and traffic gravel were being utilized.
	Engr's Est.	$8,512,475.75		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,904,835.70	$112,000.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$592,781.80		
	Total	$9,497,617.50		
STPP 45-1(17)8 13 km North of Big Timber-North Work Type 140	MA Deatley Construction Clarkston, WA			C.O. No. 8 provides for removing unsuitable subgrade material between stations 142+00 and 158+00. Some areas cannot be excavated with scrapers and must be excavated by a backhoe. Rock material found within the excavation limits will be used as backfill. The quantities excavated with a scraper will be paid as sub excavation and the quantities excavated with a backhoe will be paid as muck excavation at agreed prices. Screened natural fine material will be blended in the top lift with the rock fill material and will be paid for at agreed price. The geotextile fabric needed to reinforce the weak foundation areas will be paid for at contract bid price.
	Engr's Est.	$8,512,475.75		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,904,835.70	$284,768.31	
	Total W.O.'s	$877,550.11		
	Total	$9,782,385.81		

SHEET NO. 3 OF 4 **DISTRICT BILLINGS** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 78-2(20)33 Woodard Ave-Absarokee Work Type 130	Cop Construction L.L.C. Billings, MT			C.O. No. 8 provides for 38,346 units of traffic control devices. The additional quantity of traffic control will be at the price of $0.80 per unit as specified per Special Provision 39. The additional units of traffic control are needed throughout the construction zones to protect the traveling public and project personnel. Also, a 5% incentive will be paid to the contractor for utilizing ASTM Type IX retro-reflective sign sheeting for traffic control devices per the Special Provision .
	Engr's Est.	$2,633,184.27		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$3,005,239.80	$42,585.40	
	Total W.O.'s	$272,652.40		
	Total	$3,277,892.20		
IM 90-7(75)360 Dehart-East and West Work Type 150	Schellinger Construction Co., Inc. Columbia Falls, MT			C.O. No. 6 provides for removing additional unstable subgrade material at various planned digout locations. The additional quantity of unstable material excavated from the planned digout locations will be paid for at contract bid price.
	Engr's Est.	$8,690,235.05		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,322,645.75	$109,083.80	
	Total W.O.'s	$66,820.37		
	Total	$8,389,466.12		

SHEET NO. 4 OF 4 **DISTRICT BILLINGS** **MONTH NOVEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
BR 420-1(4)0 Sheep Cr.-Absarokee Work Type 222	Bullock Contracting Boulder, MT			C.O. No. 1 provides for extra compensation to work around an existing utility line. The utility line will be lifted to allow construction work to proceed on schedule rather than waiting for 2-3 months to have the line moved at a cost of approximately $20,000. The extra compensation to work around an existing utility conflict will be paid at agreed price.
	Engr's Est.	$127,924.00		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$183,304.11	$11,600.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$11,600.00		
	Total	$194,904.11		
BR 568-1(13)0 BNRR-2 km West of Pompey's Pillar Work Type 221 *Tied to IM 94-1(64)23* *Pompey's Pillar* *Interchange*	Sletten Construction Co. Great Falls, MT			C.O. No. 6 provides for a lump sum administrative settlement to resolve a Notice of Potential Claim that was filed by the Contractor. Due to an underrun in plan quantity of the wick drains, the contractor received an insufficient amount of compensation for the fixed quantity of wick drain sand blanket, which was included in the wick drain bid item. The settlement amount will satisfy the contactors claim and will be the final payment for the entire quantity of wick drain sand blanket placed on the project.
	Engr's Est.	$3,316,371.03		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$3,366,136.70	$19,095.60	
	Total W.O.'s	$67,430.02		
	Total	$3,433,566.72		

BILLINGS DISTRICT TOTAL $877,828.62

SUMMARY OF WORK ORDER TOTALS **MONTH: DECEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

MISSOULA DISTRICT	$ 183,089.67
BUTTE DISTRICT	20,000.00
GREAT FALLS DISTRICT	100,000.00
GLENDIVE DISTRICT	235,377.00
BILLINGS DISTRICT	0.00
MONTH'S TOTAL	$ 538,466.67

SHEET NO. 1 OF 3 DISTRICT MISSOULA MONTH DECEMBER YEAR 2004

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPHS 5-2(99)37 Turn Bays-Ninepipe Type Code: 310	Frontier West Missoula, MT			Change order No. 1 provides for more than one type of pile hammer for this project. A vibratory hammer (ICE 216) was used to start the pile and it was determined the hammer would not drive the pile to depth. At that time, a larger viboratory hammer (ICE 22-30) was brought in to start and drive the pile to an elevation at which time a diesel hammer (ICE 42S) could be safely used to drive the pile to the plan tip elevation.
	Engr's Est.	$1,283,801.91		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$1,221,802.02	$31,293.60	
	Total W.O.'s	$31,293.60		
	Total	$1,253,095.62		
NH 5-2(119)19 No of Arlee – Vic White Coyote Type Code: 140	Frontier West Missoula, MT			Change order No. 2 provides for an approach design change. The plan design for the Morigeau approach (Sta. 0+00 - 2+55) and the Curtis approach (Sta. 100+00 - 100+58) did not comply with the RW agreement (Parcel 2-211). Therefore the approach design will be changed from a 6.0 meter width to a 10 meter width. Typicals 11, 12 and 13 were redesigned to meet the requirements of the agreement. The alignment for the Morigeau was shifted 2.0 meters to the east to avoid impacting the Dumontier approach.
	Engr's Est.	$7,935,709.22		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$7,425,189.79	$5,339.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$5,339.00		
	Total	$7,430,528.79		

SHEET NO. 2 OF 3 DISTRICT MISSOULA MONTH DECEMBER YEAR 2004

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH-PLH 7-1(93)68F N of Stevensville Wye – Florence Work Type: 130	Schellinger Const Co., Inc. Columbia Falls, MT			Change order No. 6 provides for using muck excavation to improve erosion control and overall apprearance of the project. This material will be placed as topsoil on the designed 1 1/2:1 and 2:1 slopes from Station 182+00 to Station 185+00 left & right. The areas will require approximately 1450 m3 of topsoil. The work will commence with the Engineers approval and upon completion will be immediately seeded and fertilized. If re-vegetation of these slopes cannot be coordinated with other project re-vegetation areas, than additional compensation for mobilization will be paid under Miscellaneous work.
	Engr's Est.	$11,787,897.75		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$10,836,412.66	$14,375.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$604,429.74		
	Total	$11,440,842.40		
IM 90-1(141)0 Lookout Pass – East Type Code: 232	Acme Concrete Paving, Inc. Spokane, WA			Change order No. 4 provides for replacement of thickened slabs. It was discovered throughout the project that numerous locations of PCCP replacement have thickened slabs which would have resulted in extensive cost overruns and/or quantity overruns of PCCP slab replacement. Crushed base course will be used in lieu of the thickened portion of the PCCP slab replacement at $35.00 per M3. Additionally, there are extra costs incurred in removing the existing thickened slabs at 11.542 per M2 for PCCP 200mm in the thickened slab areas.
	Engr's Est.	$5,983,704.11		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,541,626.98	$103,446.47	
	Total W.O.'s	$406,690.08		
	Total	$8,948,317.06		

SHEET NO. 3 OF 3 **DISTRICT MISSOULA** **MONTH DECEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
IM 90-1(141)0 Lookout Pass – East Type Code: 232	Acme Concrete Paving, Inc. Spokane, WA			Change order No. 6 provides for repairs to the scour area. A hydraulic survey conducted while the project was active indicated a scour area on a bridge spanning the St Regis River at Sta. 31+0.474 EB, 3KM West of St. Regis. Material will be execavated around the pier subject to scouring to repair the scour damage and to prevent further erosion. Riprap material will be placed in the excavated areas.
	Engr's Est.	$5,983,704.11		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$8,541,626.98	$28,635.60	
	Total W.O.'s	$406,690.08		
	Total	$8,948,317.06		

DISTRICT TOTAL $183,089.67

SHEET NO. 1 OF 1 DISTRICT BUTTE MONTH DECEMBER YEAR 2004

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
STPP 60-1(15)12 Culvert – No of White Sulphur Springs Type Code: 141	Helena Sand & Gravel, DBA Blahnik Hamilton, MT			Change order No. 1 provides for excess traffic control. In accordance with Special Provision 27, Traffic Control in excess of 100% of the plan quantity will be paid at $0.80/unit.
	Engr's Est.	$226,999.60		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$178,997.23	$20,000.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$20,000.00		
	Total	$198,997.23		

DISTRICT TOTAL $20,000.00

SHEET NO. 1 OF 1 DISTRICT GREAT FALLS MONTH DECEMBER YEAR 2004

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH-CM 60-2(62)91 10th Ave South-26th to 38th – Great Falls Type Code: 160	United Materials of Great Falls Great Falls, MT			Change order No. 5 provides for additional traffic control. Add 125,000 units of traffic control at $0.80/unit in accordance with the traffic control special provision
	Engr's Est.	$1,592,316.41		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$1,937,326.38	$100,000.00	
	Total W.O.'s	$129,704.02		
	Total	$2,067,030.40		
DISTRICT TOTAL			$100,000.00	

SHEET NO. 1 OF 2 DISTRICT GLENDIVE MONTH DECEMBER YEAR 2004

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH 57-5(24)212F Jordan – East Type Code: 140	Riverside Contracting, Inc. Missoula, MT			Change order No. 3 provides for muck excavation and special borrow in multiple areas that would not support normal excavation equipment. It is agreed to excavate 6 meters left and right of centerline and to a depth of 1m below subgrade to support equipment during backfilling. Where needed, a geotextile fabric will be placed prior to backfilling. The landowner of the adjacent propery at Sta. 79+60 left and right opted not to have the 100mm PVC casing installed under the new roadway and accepted payment through Right-of-Way for not having the casing pipe installed.
	Engr's Est.	$10,043,485.88		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$11,393,247.52	$167,702.80	
	Total W.O.'s	$232,523.14		
	Total	$11,625,770.66		

SHEET NO. 1 OF 2 **DISTRICT GLENDIVE** **MONTH DECEMBER** **YEAR 2004**

PROJECT NUMBERS & DESIGNATION	CONTRACTOR		AMOUNT	WORK DESCRIPTION
NH 57-5(24)212F Jordan – East Type Code: 140	Riverside Contracting, Inc. Missoula, MT			Change order No. 5 provides to fully resolve the claim submitted by the contractor for measurement and payment of special borrow. A shrink factor of approximately 8.8% will be applied to the plan quantity of special borrow for an additional quantity of special borrow equaling 12,304 cubic meters, at the bid amount.
	Engr's Est.	$10,043,485.88		
	Orig. Contr. Amt.	$11,393,247.52	$67,674.20	
	Total W.O.'s	$232,523.14		
	Total	$11,625,770.66		

DISTRICT TOTAL $235,377.00

Agenda item: 14

Staff person handling: Jim Lynch

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Commission discussion**

Discussion items

- *Update on tribal relations committee*

Agenda item: 15

Staff person handling: As needed

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Opportunity for public comment**

Agenda item: 16

Staff person handling: Jim Lynch

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Conference call schedule for 2005**

Background
In accordance with commission policy 14 (copy attached), conference calls for the commission to review staff recommendations and award project contracts have been scheduled as noted below. All the conference calls are on Mondays at 10am.

On the Thursday or Friday prior to the meeting, you will be sent information on how to join the call, along with details regarding the bids and staff recommendations for award.

2005		
Advertisement Date	**Bid Letting Date**	**Commission Award Date**
December 30, 2004	January 27, 2005	**February 7, 2005**
January 27, 2005	February 24, 2005	**March 7, 2005**
March 3, 2005	March 31, 2005	**April 11, 2005**
March 31, 2005	April 28, 2005	**May 9, 2005**
April 28, 2005	May 26, 2005	**June 6, 2005**
May 26, 2005	June 23, 2005	**July 5, 2005**
June 23, 2005	July 21, 2005	**August 1, 2005**
July 21, 2005	August 18, 2005	**August 29, 2005**
August 25, 2005	September 22, 2005	**October 3, 2005**
October 6, 2005	November 3, 2005	**November 14, 2005**
November 3, 2005	December 1, 2005	**December 12, 2005**

****

MONTANA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION POLICY STATEMENT

Adopted by the Montana Transportation Commission
during regular session on November 22, 2002
Policy Number 14

****

EXPEDITE CONTRACT AWARDS

Contractors securing permits has become complex and very time consuming. A contractor cannot begin the permit application process until the Commission awards the contract. In order move the award process along expeditiously the following guidelines will become effective on the date it is approved.

GUIDELINES FOR AWARD PROCESS

The following steps will be followed to contract awards.

1. Contract lettings are held on Thursdays and those dates are set one year in advance.

2. On the next Thursday following the letting (7 days) a review meeting will be held to formulate recommendations.

3. The recommendation for award letter will be faxed or emailed to the Commissioners the next Friday (8 days after the letting). This letter will contain the Department's recommendations for award and a conference call schedule.

4. The conference call to award the contracts will be held the next Monday after the award letter is sent (11 days after the letting date). If the Monday that is set for award is a holiday the award day will be moved to Tuesday, which will be 12 days after the bid opening.

_____

Chairman, Montana Transportation Commission

Agenda item: 17

Staff person handling: Jim Lynch

Date/location: February 24, 2005 in Helena, MT

Item: **Schedule next commission meetings**

January 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

February 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28					

March 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

April 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

May 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

June 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

July 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

August 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

September 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

October 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

November 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

December 2005

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Calendar generated on http://www.timeanddate.com/calendar/